

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-8 and 10-20 are pending in the above-identified application. Claim 9 has been cancelled. New claim 20 has been added.

Claims 1, 4-5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Inoue. The rejection of claim 9 is moot due to the cancellation of claim 9. Claim 1 is amended to recite features neither disclosed or suggested by the prior art, namely,

... a material identifier identifying the material stored in the material storage ...

... media identification information for identifying the first external media ...

... media identification information for identifying the second external media ...

... the information specifying the respective storing places of the material in the first and second external media and the media identification information for identifying the first and second external media correspond to the material identifier and the storing position of the material in said material storage.

Basis for these amendments may be found, for example, in the specification at page 10, line 19 to page 13, line 8 and Fig. 2.

As shown at Fig. 2, Applicants' exemplary embodiment includes information stored in material information unit 150. The information includes a material identifier 141 which identifies the material stored in the material storage 140 and media identification information 162 and 172 for identifying the first and second external media. That is, Applicants' exemplary embodiment discloses "... a material identifier identifying the material stored in the material storage," "... media identification information for identifying the first external media," and "... media identification information for identifying the second external media," as recited in claim 1.

The information also includes material area information 181 showing a storing position of the material in said material storage and information 163 and 173

specifying the respective storing places of the material in the first and second external media. The information 163 and 173 specifying the respective storing places of the material in the first and second external media and the media identification information 162 and 172 for identifying the first and second external media correspond to the material identifier and the storing position of the material in said material storage.

For example, the reel number 10000000 (identifying the first external media) and the time code 1:00-1:30 of the first external media and the reel number 50000000 (identifying the second external media) and the time code 5:00-5:30 of the second external media correspond to material identifier 1 stored at sectors 100-130 (storing position of the material) of the material storage 140. That is, Applicants' exemplary embodiment also discloses "...the information specifying the respective storing places of the material in the first and second external media and the media identification information for identifying the first and second external media correspond to the material identifier and the storing position of the material in said material storage," as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action admits that Inoue does not disclose media identification information for identifying the first and second external media. Inoue also does not disclose "a material identifier identifying the material stored in the material storage," as recited in claim 1. Further, Inoue does not disclose "... the information specifying the respective storing places of the material in the first and second external media and the media identification information for identifying the first and second external media correspond to the material identifier and the storing position of the material in said material storage," as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claims 4-5 ultimately depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 4-5 are likewise allowable over the art of record.

Claims 2-3 and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Inoue and Official Notice taken by the Examiner. These claims are allowable, however, because they ultimately depend from allowable claim 1.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Inoue and Flannagan et al. Claim 6 is allowable, however, because it ultimately depends from allowable claim 1.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Inoue and Purcell et al. Claim 7 is allowable, however, because it ultimately depends from allowable claim 1.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Inoue and Chong Jr. et al. Claim 8 is allowable, however, because it ultimately depends from allowable claim 1.

Claims 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Inoue and Flannagan et al. These claims are allowable, however, because they ultimately depend from allowable claim 1.

Claims 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Inoue and Purcell et al. These claims are allowable, however, because they ultimately depend from allowable claim 1.

Item 12 of the Office Action recites that claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Inoue and Purcell et al., but then recites that claims 18 and 19 are rejected in view of the same prior art. As indicated above, claim 8 was already rejected in view of Inoue and Chong Jr. et al. Applicants therefore assume that claims 18-19, and not claim 8, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Inoue and Purcell et al. These claims are allowable, however, because they ultimately depend from allowable claim 1.

New claim 20 has been added. Basis for new claim 20 may be found, for example, in the specification at page 10, line 19 to page 13, line 8 and Fig. 2. No new matter has been added.


Claim 20, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claim 20 is also allowable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Application No.: 10/706,023
Amendment Dated: April 1, 2008
Reply to Office Action of: January 2, 2008

MAT-8483US

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this Application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738
Attorney for Applicants

JLE/dmw

Dated: April 1, 2008

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

FP_239379